

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA**

<b>NANCY R.,</b>	)	
<b>pseudonymously,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Plaintiff,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>v.</b>	)	<b>Case No. CIV-25-462-G</b>
	)	
<b>PLAZA HOTELS, LLC et al.,</b>	)	
	)	
<b>Defendants.</b>	)	

**ORDER**

Now before the Court is Plaintiff Nancy R.’s Motion (Doc. No. 91), seeking an extension of time to effect service upon Defendants Plaza Hotels, LLC, Steve Ketter, Indra, LLC, OM, LLC, and Ambica, LLC.

This matter was removed to this Court on April 23, 2025. *See* Notice of Removal (Doc. No. 1). “After the removal of an action from state court the case will proceed as if it originally had been brought in the federal court. Thus, it has been settled by numerous cases that the removed case will be governed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and all other provisions of federal law relating to procedural matters.” *Wallace v. Microsoft Corp.*, 596 F.3d 703, 706 (10th Cir. 2010) (omission and internal quotation marks omitted).

The statute governing process after removal states in pertinent part:

In all cases removed from any State court to any district court of the United States in which any one or more of the defendants has not been served with process or in which the service has not been perfected prior to removal, . . . such process or service may be completed . . . in the same manner as in cases originally filed in such district court.

28 U.S.C. § 1448. Further, Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(m) provides:

If a defendant is not served within 90 days after the complaint is filed, the court—on motion or on its own after notice to the plaintiff—must dismiss the action without prejudice against that defendant or order that service be made within a specified time. But if the plaintiff shows good cause for the failure, the court must extend the time for service for an appropriate period.

Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).


Pursuant to § 1448 and Rule 4(m), Plaintiff had 90 days from the date of removal, or until July 22, 2025, in which to complete service of process. *See id.*; *Palzer v. Cox Okla. Telecom, LLC*, 671 F. App'x 1026, 1028 (10th Cir. 2016); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(c)(1).

The record reflects that Plaintiff has diligently attempted to complete service of this lawsuit upon the relevant defendants but, through no fault of Plaintiff, has been unsuccessful. *See* Pl.'s Mot. at 1-2, 4; *id.* Exs. 1, 2 (Doc. Nos. 91-1, 91-2). Accordingly, the Court finds that Plaintiff has shown good cause and shall grant Plaintiff an additional 60 days to serve summonses and the pleading upon Defendants Plaza Hotels, LLC, Steve Ketter, Indra, LLC, OM, LLC, and Ambica, LLC. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(m).

### CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiff's Motion (Doc. No. 91) is GRANTED. Plaintiff's deadline to serve process on the identified Defendants is hereby extended to September 20, 2025. If Plaintiff has not made proof of service by that date, Plaintiff's claims against any unserved defendant may be subject to dismissal without prejudice.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 25th day of July, 2025.

  
CHARLES B. GOODWIN  
United States District Judge